

Office Action the title was objected to and claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a). No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-15 are presented for consideration.

Title

The title was objected to. The Office Action alleges that the title was not descriptive. Applicants have replaced the title with the new title that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants, therefore, request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirakawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,126) in view of DeLorme (U.S. Patent No. 5,559,707) and further in view of Dunworth (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474). In making this rejection, the Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these three references and that the combination of these three references teach and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites a system for transmitting and receiving electronic mail. This system includes a text input means for entering a text of the electronic mail to be transmitted. An extracting means extracts a character string to specify a place from the text inputted by the text input means. An adding means adds information to the electronic mail. The information added corresponds to the place specified by the extracted character string. A text display means displays the text in the electronic mail.

A map display means displays map information indicating the specified place corresponding to the information added to the electronic mail.

Hirakawa teaches a human interface system for communicating between network users. Fig. 1 illustrates a plurality of computers 100 connected in a network. Fig. 2 illustrates an example of one of these computers. Each computer includes an input section 120 that may be formed from a keyboard and/or a mouse with which the user enters characters or commands. A display section 110, which may be a display unit, provides for displaying information including the text of e-mail. A communication section 130 connects each computer to the network. A control section 160 connects the input section 120, the display section 110 and the communication section 130.

The Office Action asserts that Hirakawa teaches an extracting means for extracting a character string to specify a place from the text input by the text input means. The Office Action makes reference to column 2, line 55 of Hirakawa. This section of Hirakawa teaches that it was well-known in the prior art to retrieve information on a desired function from an on-line user manual by specifying a particular keyword. Information on the desired function would be retrieved using full-text searching/retrieving techniques.

The Office Action also alleges that Hirakawa teaches an adding means for adding information to the electronic mail, the information corresponding to the place specified by the extracted character string. The Office Action makes reference to column 33, lines 34-42 of Hirakawa. This section of Hirakawa teaches determining the degree of importance of the received message for the called party on the basis of

urgency information added to the message by the calling party and the state of the called party obtained from the called party's state judging unit.

Consequently, it appears that Hirakawa fails to teach an extracting means for extracting a character string to specify a place from the text inputted by the text input means and adding means for adding information to the electronic mail, the information corresponding to the place specified by the extracted character string. Specifically, it appears that the "extracting means" taught in Hirakawa relates to searching a user manual or help manual based on a keyword inputted by the user. In contrast, the extracting means disclosed in the present specification relates to extracting a place name and/or location based on the text in an e-mail message. It also appears that the extraction discussed in the present specification doesn't utilize or employ keywords as required by Hirakawa.

The information added to an e-mail or other communication by Hirakawa doesn't appear to relate to any information that was extracted from characters within the e-mail. In contrast, it appears that Hirakawa teaches using urgency information that was specifically added by the calling party and the state of the called party to determine the degree of importance of a received message. It doesn't appear that the degree of importance is ever added to the received message.

The Office Action admits that Hirakawa fails to explicitly teach a system specifying a place and a map display means. The Office Action cites DeLorme as teaching the use of a map display for showing map information of a specified place. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the map navigation feature of

DeLorme with the system of Hirakawa so that map information could be transmitted and received.

As an initial matter, Applicants have carefully reviewed Hirakawa and could find no reference to displaying navigation information, maps, waypoints or any other information which would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that the addition of a map display for showing map information should or could be added to the system disclosed in Hirakawa.

DeLorme teaches a computer aided routing system. The system determines a travel route between a user selected origin and destination following user selected waypoints. The computer aided routing system database includes travel information obtained from a range of multimedia sources about transportation routes waypoints and points of interest selected by the user along the travel route.

DeLorme appears to teach displaying maps with user selected waypoints. Additionally, this reference may calculate an optimum route based on the user selected waypoint list.

DeLorme also teaches extracting a street address stored in a database as a waypoint input. DeLorme, however, fails to disclose and/or suggest how this extraction may occur. It would appear that the simplest method of extracting waypoint information from the database would be if the waypoint information were included in the database. Thus, a user could search the database for an address and the waypoint could be extracted from the database entry when the user selects the address as a waypoint. This process, however, is distinct from the extracting means for extracting a character string to specify a place from the text input by the text input means recited by the present claims.

The Office Action admits that DeLorme and Hirakawa fail to explicitly teach and/or suggest launching a map program for a different user. The Office Action cites Dunworth as correcting this deficiency in the combination of Hirakawa and DeLorme.

Dunworth teaches an Internet organizer for accessing geographically and topically based information. Therefore, a user may initiate a regional geographic search from a personal computer or other terminal connected to the Internet. Dunworth, however, fails to disclose that it would be desirable or even possible for one user to conduct a search of the geographically and topically based information and then transmit that information to a second user in an e-mail. Accordingly, it appears that Dunworth fails to explicitly teach launching a map program for a different user. Accordingly, Dunworth fails to correct the deficiency noted in the Office Action in the combination of DeLorme and Hirakawa.

The combination of Hirakawa, DeLorme and Dunworth fail to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, the combination of these three references fail to teach an extracting means for extracting a character string specifying a place from the text inputted by the text input means. These references also fail to teach and/or suggest an adding means for adding information to the electronic mail the information corresponding to the place specified by the extracted character string. The combination of these references also fails to teach and/or suggest a map display means for displaying map information indicating the specified place corresponding to the information added to the electronic mail. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 USC §103(a).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendments and remarks have overcome the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated June 21, 2002. Specifically, the new title overcomes the objection to the title. Applicant's remarks have distinguished the claimed invention from the cited prior art and thus overcome the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 USC §103(a). Consequently, claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned Attorney by telephone, if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any additional which may be required with respect to this paper to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to Attorney Docket No. 107439-08005.

Respectfully submitted,



Rustan J. Hill
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810
RJH/mzk